

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/755,540		SANCHEZ-CIFUENTES, ALVARO	
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Samson B. Lemma		2132	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Samson B. Lemma. (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Cathrine K. Kinslow Reg. No. 51,886. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 17 December 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 10.

Identification of prior art discussed: See Continuation Sheet.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: \_\_\_\_\_

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Identification of prior art discussed: Examiner and applicant's representative Cathrine K. Kinslow Reg. No. 51,886 conducted telephonic interview on December 17, 2007. Examiner and applicant's representative discussed the limitation recited in each independent claims 1 and 10 in view of the prior art on the record.

Examiner and applicant's representative agreed that incorporating dependent claims 2-4 in both independent claims 1 and 10 would overcome the ground of rejection set forth in the pervious office action and possibly make the application allowable. Examiner however indicated to the applicant's representative that further search and consideration and approval from the supervisor is required before the case is finally allowed.